

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1998
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA**

The Supreme Court of California convened in its courtroom in the Library and Courts Building, Sacramento, California on Wednesday, March 4, 1998, at 9:00 a.m.

Present: Chief Justice Ronald M. George, presiding, and Associate Justices Mosk, Kennard, Baxter, Werdegar, Chin, and Brown.

Officers present: Robert F. Wandruff, Clerk; George Rodgers, Harry Kinney, and Walter Grabowski, Bailiffs.

S050870 Timothy Toland, Appellant
 v.
 Sunland Housing Group, Incorporated, Respondent
 Cause called. Robert P. Biegler opened argument for Appellant.
 Robert S. Arns continued argument for Appellant.
 Kennth B. Shepard opened argument for Respondent Sunland
 Housing Group.
 Philip R. Placier, appearing for Amicus Curiae Sequoia Ventures
 (Bectel Corp.), continued argument for Respondent Sunland Housing
 Group.
 Mr. Biegler replied.
 Mr. Arns replied.
 Cause submitted.

S061678 People, Respondent
 v.
 Russell Donald Benson, Appellant
 Cause called. Russell S. Babcock argued for Appellant.
 Ellen Birnbaum Kehr argued for Respondent.
 Mr. Babcock replied.
 Cause submitted.

Court adjourned.

S065021 Jabes Salgado et al., Appellants

v.

County of Los Angeles et al., Appellants

On application of appellant County of Los Angeles and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer brief on the merits is extended to and including March 23, 1998.

S068184 David Vanderveen and Nancy Defever, Petitioners

v.

Bill Jones, Respondent

David Alessio, Real Party in Interest

The court having read and considered the petition for writ of mandate filed February 24, 1998, the letter of the Secretary of State filed February 26, 1998, and the letter of the Attorney General filed March 3, 1998, denies the petition on the grounds that (1) the lateness of the filing of the petition, considered in conjunction with the March 9, 1998, deadline for submission of the ballot pamphlet to the State Printer set forth in the letter of the Secretary of State, and (2) the apparent lack of an adversary party, has denied the court the opportunity to provide full and meaningful review. The denial of the petition is without prejudice to the consideration of a new petition should the challenged initiative measure be adopted.

Mosk, J., is of the opinion that a writ of mandate should issue.